UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

ARMISTICE DAY NUMBER

The Delusion of Disarmament
By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

What Can We Do?
By ROBERT WHITAKER

Major Attitudes Toward the Problem of Peace and War
By CURTIS W. REESE

Psychological Obstacles to Religious Experience—II
By CLARENCE R. SKINNER

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 9

Chicago, November 10, 1930

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

Subscription, $3.00 Per Annum

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY FELLOWSHIP

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JEREMIAH LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.

Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBBINS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, • Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., • } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Percy M. Dawson
David Starr Jordan
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—P. M. Matthéeff
ENGLAND—Harrison Brown, Fred Hankinson, Walter Walsh
CANADA—Norman Stewart Dowd
FRANCE—G. Demartial, Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Dorothy Walton
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoka
PALESTINE—Hans Kohn
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Special Announcement!

UNITY takes pleasure in announcing the serial publication of a book by Leo Tolstoy which has never before appeared in English.

This book by the great Russian consists of original paragraphs, or thoughts, arranged for daily readings.

Translated from the Russian text by Vladimir Tchertkoff and Alice Davis, and adapted for serial publication in these columns by Mr. Holmes, this book is now appearing under the title,

"THOUGHTS OF TOLSTOY"

Subscribe Now! *$3.00 per year*

Unity Publishing Company
700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 131
Psychological Obstacles to Religious Experience —II. CLARENCE R. SKINNER..... 133
Jottings—J. H. H..... 135

ARTICLES—

The Other Side of War—*Clara Barton*..... 131
The Delusion of Disarmament—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 136
What Can We Do?—ROBERT WHITAKER..... 138
Major Attitudes Toward the Problem of Peace and War—CURTIS W. REESE 142

POETRY—

Reward for Service—MURIEL WRIGHT 137
Military Parade—MURIEL WRIGHT 138
Armistice Day—ROBERT WHITAKER 138

THE FIELD—

"The Nation Is Dry"—*Austin E. Griffiths*.... 143
"How to Find God"..... 143
The Mid-Southern Regional Conference of National Federation of Religious Liberals..... 143

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1930 NUMBER 9

THE OTHER SIDE OF WAR

If I were to speak of war, it would not be to show you the glories of conquering armies but the mischief and misery they strew in their tracks; and how while they march on with tread of iron and plumes proudly tossing in the air, someone must follow closely in their steps, crouching to the earth, toiling in the rain and darkness, shelterless like themselves, with no thought of pride or glory, fame or praise or reward; hearts breaking with pity, faces bathed in tears and hands in blood. This is the side which history never shows.

—Clara Barton.

If the MacDonald Government has done nothing else that is right, if it has done everything else that is wrong, it is still entitled to the everlasting gratitude of mankind for its action in the matter of the Unknown Soldier. According to London reports, the Labor Cabinet has communicated to foreign governments its desire that in future official visits of foreign representatives to England, the ceremonies of visiting the grave of the Unknown Soldier and laying wreaths upon the tomb, shall be discontinued. These ceremonies, the Government argues, perpetuate the unhappy memories of war and tend to keep alive the spirit of militarism. The courage of this gesture is manifest. We confess we never expected to live to see the day when a government would dare to break the mischievous spell attaching to this Unknown Soldier performance. But England, to her eternal glory, has taken the perilous first step, and—wonder of wonders! —it is intimated that other governments are responding not unfavorably. Of course, the one hundred per centers, like "the heathen" always, will furiously "rage and . . . imagine a vain thing." We can see them foam, and hear them scream. Our own patrioteers, however, are in a poor position to bring any indictment against Britain, for the Unknown Soldier in Westminster Abbey represents more than a million dead upon the field of battle, whereas our own Unknown Soldier at Arlington represents only a few thousand. Yes, it is time to get rid of the Unknown Soldier myth. And it is time, also, to get rid of Armistice Day itself! All MacDonald's arguments against the ceremonial honoring of the Soldier's tomb apply with redoubled force to the popular observance of the holiday which memorializes the victory of arms and the humiliation of foes. Let the world act upon Mr. S. O. Levinson's suggestion to substitute August 27th for November 11th as World Peace Day!

A plea such as the above, for the abolition of Armistice Day is a peculiar way in which to open an Armistice Day Number of UNITY. But our justification may well be that we are using this number exactly as we would use it if we were celebrating a peace holiday instead of a war holiday. The pity of it is that Armistic Day has been spoiled by being made a duplication of Memorial Day, when battles are fought over again and the glory of arms reconsecrated to the future. In its origin, of course, Armistice Day was a better day than this, for it was a spontaneous expression of the hearts of war-weary men that the war to end war had at last itself been ended. But the first careless rapture of November 11, 1918, has long since disappeared, and now we are settled down to the traditional business of martial processions, waving flags, and decorated graves. Not the least of the evils of war is its perpetuation in the hearts of men as linked with tender memories and exalted sentiments. So long as war has these sacred associations, it is certain that we shall never get rid of it. Hence the importance of a Peace Day to take the place of this war day—and a Peace Day on another date, so that Germany and Austria and Hungary and Bulgaria, the defeated powers in 1918, may celebrate it as heartily as ourselves. We still cherish the vision of a day when men throughout the world, emancipated at last from wars and rumors of wars, will drop the tools of labor and even the implements of play, and give themselves devoutly to services of thanksgiving and pageants of praise that universal brotherhood has at last been established upon the earth. If any one thing will ever bring this day, it is of course the Briand-Kellogg Treaty. Hence should this Treaty be the corner-stone of the new edifice of fraternal accord which must be raised. Nor will this be any betrayal of the honored dead! How can it be, when these honored dead paid their last full measure of devotion that there might come at last, to quote Woodrow Wilson, "a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit."

We get a measure of the depths of shame to which

the British Labor Cabinet has fallen in Palestine when we see not only Lloyd-George and Gen. Smuts, but the English Tories, under the personal leadership of Stanley Baldwin and Austin Chamberlain, protesting against the Passfield pronouncement of policy toward Zionism. The action of the MacDonald Government in India is bad enough, but this action in Zion is obviously worse. Even the Conservatives cannot stand for it. What we have in both these cases, India and Palestine, is a strikingly similar line of conduct upon the part of the British imperial authorities. During the stress of the Great War, Lord Montagu promised the Indians, in return for their loyalty to the Crown, a liberal grant of self-government. In the same way, under the same stress, Lord Balfour promised the Jews of Palestine and of the world, in return for their support of the campaign against the Central Powers and Turkey, "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people." The sham of the British promise to India was revealed very speedily after the War in the enactment of the famous Rowlatt Acts and in the dreadful episode of the Amritsar massacre. The sham of the British promise to Palestine was more slowly exposed, but now is revealed in all its nakedness in the deliberate attempt of the Government to wreck the Jewish homeland by stopping immigration and by forbidding the further purchase of land. In both cases, we have an instance of treason to the plighted word which would be incredible if it were not the recorded fact. In India, this betrayal of trust and honor has turned Gandhi from a friend of England into a sworn enemy of its "Satanic government," and started the greatest non-cooperative campaign of revolution ever known in history. Similar perfidy in the Holy Land is now turning the Jews from friendship to enmity against Great Britain, and should speedily develop a similar campaign of revolt against the Crown. Zionists should now do three things—remove Zionist headquarters from England to America, appeal from London to Geneva for justice, and organize complete non-cooperation against the government in Palestine.

The addition of Palestine to India makes two issues of vast international importance on which we are uncompromisingly opposed to British policy. This gives us little satisfaction, for every drop of blood in our veins is in origin unadulterated English blood, we have more friends in England than in all other foreign countries put together, we adore the English countryside as the loveliest landscape upon this planet, we revel in English literature as incomparably the greatest literature in the world, and we reverence English political institutions as the essence of pure democracy. But if we feared that any prejudice or antagonism against England was prompting our opposition to British imperialism in the East, we should promptly be disabused by the spectacle of distinguished English leaders saying all that we have said, and more, in denunciation of the Empire. Everything that we have ever said, for example, against British rule in India has been said in stronger and nobler terms by J. Ramsay MacDonald. He has forgotten this now, but we have not! At the present hour, the opposition to the policy of the British Cabinet in India is led not by American radicals or Russian "reds," but by Fenner Brockway, M. P., and the more than twenty members of the Independent Labor Party sitting in the Commons. As for Palestine, the fiercest denunciations, as we have said above, have come from the Tory leaders inside England, and from great liberal leaders in the Dominions, like General Smuts. The most heroic tradition in English life, to our way of thinking, is the great tradition of antagonism to British imperialism, as glorified by such names as Lord Macauley, John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Leslie Stephen, John Morley, William Ewart Gladstone, Wilfrid Scawen Blunt, Campbell-Bannerman, and J. Ramsay MacDonald. These men are our authority for all that we are saying in these columns about British imperialism today.

Nothing so angers us, so disheartens us, as the frequent brutality of the United States Government in attacking the smallest instead of the largest among our citizens, and "taking it out" of those who are least able to defend themselves from injury. We remember how outraged we were during the War when humble and helpless pacifists were picked off for persecution in the small towns, while more conspicuous offenders, of far greater reputation and influence, were left untouched. Not until the Government tackled Debs, did it act with any dignity worthy of its cause. Well, it is now twelve years since the close of the War, and still this miserable business is going on. Take the case of the *Revolutionary Age,* for example! This is an obscure little bi-weekly paper published by a tiny group of Communists who are not only hated and hunted by American capitalists, but have actually been outlawed from grace by the Russian Bolsheviki. Fired upon by both sides on the Communist front, it is difficult to imagine a more forlorn and hopeless remnant of men and women. And it is the journalistic organ of these people, as pitiful a paper as there is in the whole United States, which the Government has singled out for suppression by denying it the use of the mails! Then there is our friend, Marcus Graham, whose case has already appeared in these columns. Graham is a humble poet, a lover of literature and life, like Shelley a dreamer of a happier day and a better world for men. In addition he is the editor of a volume of revolutionary poetry, which was duly reviewed in UNITY and praised in many other places. Now this man has been arrested by federal officers on a trumped-up charge,

and is threatened with dire punishment. How damnable it is! The Government is feeble, timid, ineffective, whenever it comes face to face with criminals of any importance. But it looms suddenly like a colossal giant whenever it lays its hands upon some feeble and friendless soul. When we were a boy, we used to shout at the bully in the school-yard, "Why don't you take somebody your own size?"

The book market is obviously in a disastrously depressed condition. The publishers are alarmed, and are reported to be considering desperate remedies. The sudden eruption of dollar books is the application of one remedy—and a silly one, for we cannot imagine the cheap price of a book stirring anybody to read who has not read before. Which tempts us to raise the question as to why the publishers and booksellers do not go out and try to create a new reading public out of the millions of people in this country who apparently never buy and do not own a book! Modern salesmanship boasts of its success in creating wants, and thus inducing the public to buy what it did not know existed. Why not apply the principles and methods of this salesmanship to the book trade? The publishers obviously believe in advertising, and are many of them lavish in their expenditure of money for this purpose. But where do they advertise? In the New York *Times Book Review,* in the New York *Herald-Tribune Books,* in the *Saturday Review of Literature,* in the Chicago *Evening News,* in the Boston *Transcript* —in the very papers, in other words, whose readers are already book-lovers who had rather read than eat, and who would themselves find out about the new books if they had to die for it. But what about other papers? Here is a chance copy of *Good Housekeeping,* which must number its readers by the million. This magazine overflows with "ads." The largest classification is "food products," then "druggists' supplies and toilet articles," then "house supplies and utensils," "home furnishings and decoration," "kitchen supplies," etc. Are any books advertised? O, yes, here is a heading, "Stationery, books, gift cards, etc." But *what* books? "Compton's Pictured Encyclopaedia," "Encyclopaedia Britannica," "Good Housekeeping Cook Book," "Settlement Cook Book," and "Choice Candy Recipes"! A sorry showing! A survey of the other "ads" shows that the readers of this magazine are assumed to have money, intelligence, and good taste. Yet the book publishers do not try to find one book buyer among them. No wonder the trade is dull!

Psychological Obstacles to Religious Experience

II*

History is full of strange ironies, but surely none is more strange than the change which has come over the relations between psychology and religion in the last twenty-five years. A more complete reversal could hardly be imagined, for the very doctrines which were seized upon by the religionists as bulwarks to their faith are now turned against religion as deadliest enemies. If we want to utterly demolish the validity of any theological ideas or religious experiences today, we do not turn to geology or biology and least of all to physics, but rather we arm ourselves with arguments taken from the field of psychology. Specifically, we point to the "will to believe" as complete nullification of the trustworthiness of belief, and if the apologist retreats into the hidden depths of the subconscious, the "modern" psychologist has him just where he wants him, for there, if anywhere, is the seat of the low, animalistic drives of human nature.

A brief analysis of two specific fields will reveal the extent and significance of the complete change which has taken place, and finally the result upon religious experience will be noted. These changes constitute "psychological obstacles to religious experience" which inhibit large numbers of men and women in the modern world from entering into the sphere of religious values.

First, the change in our attitude toward the will to believe. The phrase has been changed to "wishful thinking," and in the hands of Freudians becomes devastating and terrorizing to the apologists of religion. Instead of believing with Professor James that the passional nature of man should be trusted to lead us to the most valued truths about our lives, it must be distrusted as obviously playing tricks with our believing nature. Most psychologists, no matter of what school, agree in recognizing the fact of a tremendously strong "will to believe" in man. They recognize it so clearly that many would say that all thinking is motivated by a desire to reach some end preordained by our desires, and that it is absolutely impossible for man to think anything except what he hopes for and yearns for with his passional nature. Given a desire to drink alcoholic liquor, the mind will rationalize the craving into an argument which satisfies the individual, but which cannot be depended upon as a true judgment. Given the desire to burn negroes at the stake, the "will to believe" will construct "good" arguments for the burning which will satisfy the intellectual requirements of the man who both wants to burn negroes and at the

*See first instalment of this editorial in last week's UNITY.—Editor.

same time hold his self-respect as a man of intelligence and reason.

But when a person, who is neutral to the passional nature of the drinker or the torturer, examines the soundness of the logic which has led to the drinking or the burning, he can see that the rationalizing is invalidated because it arises from a wish. Or if a man who has a "will to believe" in prohibition or negro equality arrives at conclusions which are diametrically opposite to those of the first group, then again the soundness of wishful thinking is challenged, and we doubt whether man can arrive at conclusions which are objectively demonstrable by that avenue and method.

And when we come to the field of religion, modern psychology clearly shows that there are more difficulties in arriving at truth by wishful thinking than in any other sphere of human life because of the almost insuperable difficulty of objective criteria.

In natural science, such as chemistry, physics, astromony or geology there is comparatively little harm done by the will to believe, for the tests and measurements of physical phenomena have developed to a point where there is almost complete unanimity. Therefore a desire to believe that the sun moves around the earth or that the earth is flat does comparatively little harm, for the case can be referred to something like an objective standard. Even in the realm of politics, economics, race relations and other sociological phenomena, the difficulties of arriving at truth by wish-motivated thought is less than in religion, for here there are at least *some* outward norms for judgment. We can *see* the results of high tariff, giant monopolies, and prejudice. So concrete and objective are the effects of many forms of a social will to believe, that, again, we have a body of opinion, not unanimous, but decisive, by which we can judge.

But, as stated above,—when we enter the field of religion these norms and standards are far less objective; and the body of common opinion which might act as a deterrent to confounding wish with fact is sadly lacking. Therefore in religion, perhaps more than in any other sphere, we have the dangers of a will to believe.

Of course Professor James would reply that the vaunted objectivity of science is in reality nothing more nor less than another form of subjectivity; for after all, what is a standard and norm, but just a mental process? True. But we must not lose sight of the fact that the multitudinous subjectivities in science seem to arrange themselves into some sort of harmony;—they are capable of classification, and they do elicit a large amount of agreement. Not so, however, in the field of religious phenomena. Even granting that these subjectivities are of the same *kind* with science, they most assuredly vary in *degree,* so that they must be put into a separate category.

A brief history of religious thought will reveal amazing examples of the vagaries which the will to believe, unchecked, may lead to.

To list only a few of the contradictory statements of religious and theological apologists. We know God through personal experience; we cannot know him through personal experience. God is three, three gods are one. God is one; there are a thousand gods. We should trust mysticism; we cannot trust mysticism. We can know God through reason; we cannot know God through reason. We are saved by faith; we are saved by works. Bibles are infallible; bibles are full of fallacies. The Kingdom of God is coming out of the skies by a cataclysmic process; the Kingdom of God is coming out of the hearts of men by an evolutionary process. The highest value is selflessness; the highest value is self-fulfillment. We should rejoice in seeing our relatives burning in hell; we should rebel at the thought of anyone burning in hell. And so we could go on almost endlessly, stating the diametrically opposite and self-contradictory ideas held by people who are equally religious.

And why such variety of opinion? Why such apparent vagary of belief? How do we know that any of them have approximated an objective truth? To these questions the psychologists of some modern schools would reply. Here we have "a vision of fulfilled desire," and as desires vary with time, place, and temperament, this body of ideas and experiences really gives us an excellent description of the inner state of man's psychic life, but not necessarily an accurate picture of reality outside the individual.

A careful analysis of some of the commonly accepted religious ideas shows clearly that at bottom they may be wish-fulfillments. The idea of the Father-God who knows us as He knows every feather of the sparrow; the God who cares for us in trial, who sympathizes with us in our sorrows, who has a tender and all-loving heart even toward the most wayward; such a God would indeed be a solace of infinite value to the human race. It is easy for most people to *wish* that it might be so, but by retreating into an infantile state of mind, says our psychologist, we can easily *believe* it to be so.

Thus the modern scientist touches the poetry, romance, and beauty of our dreams and suddenly a cold fear creeps upon us, a fear that we are being fooled into comfort, and that our wish-world will presently come crashing about our ears. Then we shall be left naked and disillusioned among the ruins of our former world. Therefore the gospel of despair as preached by Joseph Wood Krutch who logically and bravely tears down all our illusions and declares that all there is left to do is to grit our teeth, harden our hearts and be ready to take the "blows of outrageous fortune." Therefore, also, the less despairing and

more gentle philosophy of Walter Lippman who declares: "The great divide lies between those who think their wishes are of more than human significance and those who do not." So let us follow "high religion," the function of which "is to reveal to men the quality of mature experience." It is "a prophecy and an anticipation of what life is like when desire is in perfect harmony with reality. It announces the discovery that men can enter into the realm of the spirit when they have outgrown all childishness."

The psychologist deals similarly with the doctrine of the subconscious as peculiarly the seat of religious experience. While Meyers believed that a subliminal uprush brought with it high truths, noble intimations, and hints of things divine, Freud looks down into this abysm and finds it full of egoism, infantilism, sex and passion. Again, how complete a reversal of opinion, and how strange an irony that the very bulwark of religion should now become one of its deadliest and most feared enemies!

The Freudian, either of the extreme or moderate type does not deny that much of what is most beautiful in art, music, poetry and religion has its roots in the subconscious. On the contrary, he would vehemently assert the fact; but the moral which he attaches to it is far different from that which James furtively hoped.

Let us take an example. There are few if any more beautiful poems in the English language than Keats' "Ode to a Grecian Urn." From the point of view of the technique of literature, it is almost if not quite perfect. One visualizes the imagery with etched clearness, and one feels the beauty of the central concept: love immortalized in its moment of youthful purity. But if a psycho-analyst were to dissect the work, he would find evidences of Keats' maladjusted sexual life at the bottom of the subconscious, and he would find this exquisite beauty motivated by a compensation mechanism of which Keats was blissfully ignorant. Defeated love, unsatisfied sex, a whole complex of thwarted desires, might be discovered as the fundamental ground-work upon which these delicate and singing words are woven.

And so with religion. No psycho-analyst denies the importance of the sub-conscious as determining the pattern of religious practice and theological speculation.† But the noble and beautiful in the imagery, the piety, the worship and the sacrifice is traced not to some hidden source of beauty, but to some hidden source of sex passion or egoism.

For instance, a professor of psychology who has written an excellent book and who has done practical work that has brought him fame and high salary points out that for *men* to worship "Our Father" God is a sign of homosexuality. It is permissible for women to reverence the Father, but men should have an "Eternal Mother" for the object of their devotions. How vastly different this interpretation of the subconscious from the poetic psychology which sees in worship a "subliminal uprush" bearing intimations of noble revelations and divine truths.

It is not necessary to elaborate upon the point. The new interpretation of religious phenomena by the Freudians is sufficiently well known. There is no poetry, beauty or ecstasy which they do not trace to its root in some maladjustment of sex, parental fixation, or drive to power. They do not deny the beauty of the prophets' dream, but its beauty is that of a compensatory mechanism. They do not deny the nobility of the nun who cloisters herself in a convent or becomes a little sister of the poor. But it is a nobility of a being finding an outlet for normal drives in an abnormal and distorted manner. Prayers, hymns, liturgies, saints, saviors, gods,—these all have their loveliness and nobleness. But it is a loveliness and nobleness of illusion!

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

†See Everett Dean Martin's "Mystery of Religion."

(To be concluded)

Jottings

The forces which first created life on this planet, says a great scientist, are no longer active. Thank God, say we! There's some hope for the world, after all.

Chiang Kai-shek has been converted to Methodism. As Gen. Feng is already a Christian, this means that there are two Christian generals in China. This would seem to be a sure sign that the wars there will now be bloodier than ever.

The Association Against the Prohibition Amendment collected $528,686 last year. Of this amount, $413,945 was given by 649 persons; and of this latter sum, most was given by 6 persons—the Du Ponts, Rascob, Arthur Curtis James, Edward S. Harkness, and Richard T. Crane. The *Christian Century* is right in declaring that "it is the rich who are trying to get rid of Prohibition."

For a thing which is "inevitable," which "can't be stopped," which "must come," which is "just around the corner," the return of prosperity is the slowest moving phenomenon we have ever seen or heard of. A glacier is nothing to it!

French trade fell off nine billion francs in the first eight months of 1930 as compared with the same

months of 1929. Experts in France, we are told, were encouraged by the fact that the slump in September was smaller than in any other month. This sounds like falling off an eight-story building and finding comfort as you pass the first story that you have only one more story to go!

It is fortunate that Lord Passfield, who wrote the report on British policy in Palestine which has so deeply stirred the ire of Jews everywhere, changed his name some time ago. This happy fact leaves the honored name of Sidney Webb unsullied.

J. H. H.

The Delusion of Disarmament

A Critique of the London Naval Treaty

"Our century old controversy with Great Britain about how the seas should be ruled, is a fundamental issue in any discussion of naval armaments. If it does not appear on the Agenda, it will be because some agreement—tacit or formal—has been reached before the Conference opens. . . . Always our statesmen have considered this matter a 'vital interest,' and from time to time, when some incident has brought it to the front page of our newspapers, public opinion has rallied to their support. We broke off diplomatic relations with France when Napoleon's 'Continental blockade' interfered with our rights at sea. We fought the war of 1812 with Great Britain on the same issue. It was in defense of these rights we smashed the Barbary Pirates. And it was what happened to our citizens at sea in 1914-15-16 that brought the Great War home to us . . . To ignore the issue . . . would simply be hiding our heads in the sand. We cannot be indifferent to the law which rules the sea."—Arthur Bullard, in the New York *Times* on the eve of the Washington Naval Conference in 1921.

The principal result of the late Conference of London is not to be read in the Treaty, bristling with guns and with statistical parity, as ratified by the Senate. The principal result is the political implication which lies in the background—the facts that no code of acceptable marine laws defining the obligations of the naval powers, no real, equilateral juridical barriers to long-range, merciless violence, including, the imposition of blockades and of slow starvation, has yet been raised; that the freedom of the seas has not been officially discussed, or publicly elucidated, in the white light of the Pact of Paris; and that in place of such discussion and agreement in terms of law, a working Anglo-American *entente* has been forged on the anvil of diplomacy, presenting an apparently solid front of invincible sea-power to the alarmed gaze of the pan-European and the anti-capitalist, anti-imperialist world beyond the pale. It is this which gives the clue to the solution of the competitive armament puzzle and the criterion of judgment concerning the value to peace of the tri-partite naval standardization Treaty. Although the great Conference was the first to assemble after the ratification of the golden covenant solemnly outlawing and renouncing war as an instrument of national policy, the spirit of the Pact of Paris and whatever virtue there is in it was solemnly ignored by the totality of the operating assumptions and the realistic proceedings at London, which were not conspicuously different from similar proceedings at international conferences before the advent of the Outlawry of War. Appropriately enough, by a curious coincidence of objections, all reference to the Kellogg-Briand Treaty was omitted even from the Mooted Treaty's preamble, all the efforts of the American delegation to the contrary notwithstanding. . . . Here, then, is a meal of irony prepared for the cynics of the future who will rise to comment with acidulated pens upon the madness or the hypocritical folly of the statesmen of the age of science and the competitive high-powered machine! America summons the world to a high moral and political renunciation of collective sin and social suicide, goes to London to seal the compact with disarmament, but returns with a solemn international authorization to build a larger and costlier navy than its jingoes ever seriously deemed to be politically feasible before.

This singular omission of the central reality of the problem from consideration and debate at the Conference of London—a reality which the French vainly sought to bring into the limelight—indicates more eloquently than any words the fundamental distrust in peace and in the Pact of Peace among the governments which created it. It reveals, still more, the unaltered resolution of the British and American governments in particular, acting now concertedly, to retain the military domination of the seas, as of the two inter-ocean canals, the eventual control of the world's outer highways of essential commerce and raw materials, and the untrammelled use of the long-range economic blockade, in fine, of sea-power at its deadliest—according to their own arbitrary or conjoint will and advantage. This hidden power of life and death for the nations upon the inside of the world-ring, is fittingly symbolized by the balanced Anglo-American battle-fleets of fifteen super-dreadnaughts, more or less obsolete as combat units, *retained at a maintenance cost of at least thirty-five million dollars annually,* exclusive of all replacements, by each nation.

It is this portentous historic fact, this iron hand in the velvet glove of parity, seldom discussed by the Anglo-American journalists and the official optimists, which in reality wrecked the five-power treaty and all the hopes of real achievement in disarmament, or even economy in limitation of the world's mounting and competitive navalism. The freedom of the seas, meaning the organization of peace and justice on the seas, rather than the rule of force, having been eliminated from discussion before the start of the Conference—in the same fashion as the French shrewdly eliminated all discussion of German reparations from the Genoa Conference of 1922, called to liquidate the War, —the London Naval conference was doomed to relative sterility before it convened. The inevitable rejoinder of the lesser naval powers was the retention and even the enlargement of the scope and menace of the submarine, of the type of the *Surcouf,* and of the battle-cruiser anomaly represented by the *Ersatz Preussen.*

The French were entirely ingenuous about this important matter from the outset. They deceived nobody, least of all themselves. In the French official memorandum issued on December 20, 1929, *before the delegations left for London,* their thesis was stated in language not to be misunderstood. Not to be misunderstood, that is, by anyone with eyes to read and see; but, as the event has all too unhappily proved, to

be completely ignored by reason of a prior and private Anglo-American agreement, reached at the Rapidan presumably, that all discussion of it should be barred. Said the French:

> Just as a general and technical agreement upon armaments implies previous political agreement, so does a complete naval agreement presuppose an understanding on the question of the freedom of the seas, defining the rights of belligerents and the rights of neutrals.

So long as the discussion and solution of this central issue in the problem of international security is postponed or tabooed, or carried on in secret, there will be no real progress towards naval disarmament, but, rather, increased tension in the world-circle. This is known to the experts. It is not known, or realized, by the people of America and Great Britain who, year in and year out, are systematically deluded about the cost and the menace of the naval establishments which they maintain, and which, apparently, they have now agreed to pool, by some obscure Anglo-American understanding, likewise not discussed at London. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald penned a significant sentence in his foreword to the Labor Party's campaign pamphlet, to which Lieut-Commander Kenworthy rightly directs attention. The passage reads:

Freedom of the seas is preeminently an Anglo-American problem, and until it is removed from the field of dispute Anglo-American co-operation in world affairs cannot be securely founded.

It is no less true that peace and the disarmaments of peace cannot be securely established, until this problem, which is no less the vital concern of the world of nations than it is of the United States and the British Empire, has been removed from the area of dispute into the realm of agreement and unambiguous law. The United States has vigorously contended for this in the past; it is the tragedy of London that its delegation did not contend for it there.

It must be recognized, then, that the Americans and the British, no less than the Continental powers, remain unwilling to pay—or even frankly to consider and discuss—the real price of naval disarmament or limitation. Such is the saddest word of tongue or pen that must be uttered as the epitaph of the great Conference of London. We are doomed still "to haggle in the market-place of war," in William Vaughn Moody's striking phrase, as a substitute for advancing towards an ordered international society because the most terrific physical facts, the floating fortresses of modern nationalistic technology and navalism, cannot be successfully dealt with, or their menace neutralized, by debating, in physical terms of quantitative or statistical measurement, gunnage or tonnage or armor-plate or speed. For these are but the attributes, the floating and sinister shadows, of reality. The reality lies in the sphere of human and political relations. It must be approached in terms of law and agreement concerning the potential and legitimate uses of navies *en bloc*, whether of equal battle-power or not. It is the unavoidable task of competent statesmanship and jurisprudence to define and regulate these in terms of accepted principles and obligations, i. e., in rules of international law. Such is the lesson of London, and the path of all future progress towards peace worthy of the name.

Is parity with Britain worth the price? . . . For ourselves, we believe that a repudiation of the London Treaty as a counterfeit, a resolute refusal to enter any naval race, would have carried moral and material advantages to the United States of inestimably greater value than all the parity that can ever be statistically devised; and that such action would have helped to free the world from some of its most dangerous illusions. The United States has lived and prospered mightily without naval parity for a century and a half; it can do so in the future if its statesmanship be competent and its people even moderately sensible. . . . But the issues were confused and the principles not clear. The Treaty *is* ratified. Now comes the question—shall we allow the jingoes to profit by it—Mr. Shearer and his interested friends, the Armor Plate Trust? Or shall we rather insist upon real progress being made in the only direction in which real progress can be made — the subordination of naval power and its uses to equilateral and unequivocal principles of international law?

BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Reward for Service

Parade and muted drums,
And funeral wreaths heaped high,
And from the black pall
A *croix de guerre*
Gleams like a star.
The street is packed
With heads
Bowed in silent homage.

A whisper travels through
The crowd:
"He killed seven men
At Saint Mihiel;
Single handed
He killed seven men
At Saint Mihiel."

Seven times
The pain of birth.
For seven mothers
Years of sacrifice and care.
Somewhere
A mother knelt beside a bed.
Clutching the thin coverlet
With bony hands,
She asked God
To preserve her son.

Somewhere a wife—
A wife, with fear-thick throat
And weary watching eyes,
Waited for one
Who did not come;
While round-eyed children
Asked where daddy was.
He killed seven men
At Saint Mihiel.

. . . .

An embalmer's wagon rattles by
With a cheap pine box,
Carrying the body
Of an old man
From the County Farm:
A man who delivered milk
For thirty years.
A hundred gallons a day
He delivered,
Through sweltering paved alleys
In August;
Breaking fresh tracks
Through snow
Of January dawns.
Every day the same—
Sundays and Thanksgiving
And Christmas.

Sometimes a customer
Would remember him
On Christmas
With a handkerchief,
Or a box of stuffed dates.

For thirty years
He delivered milk
For babies,
For men and women
Who scarcely thought of him
Unless he happened to be late.
And then he got rheumatism
From exposure.
And when his scanty savings
Were used up—
The County Farm
A few bleak years;
Peeling potatoes on the back stoop,
Or hobbling up and down
The graveled walk
In the sun.
Now,
Unnoticed and unmourned,
His body rattles to the grave
In a cheap pine box.
He delivered milk
For thirty years.

MURIEL WRIGHT.

Military Parade

In fleckless uniforms they come,
There is no mud or dust,
Their gleaming, polished bayonets
Are free from blood and rust.

I do not see the proud display;
But this I see instead—
A disemboweled body,
Raw flesh, a severed head.

A military band starts up,
A blare of energy and mirth;
But underneath I hear the wail
Of all the mothers of the earth.

A bit of bronze upon the breast,
A ribbon and a treasured name,
I think it is no honored thing.
To me it is a badge of shame.

MURIEL WRIGHT.

Armistice Day

O world that waits upon the age of peace!
When shall the tramp of troops, the war-drums cease?
When shall the diplomats and statesmen pass
Who feed with lies, and lust of blood, the mass?
Churchmen and schoolmen, still their tools, alas!

When shall the flags of all the world be one?
As common air, and common stars, and sun?
As art is one, and speaks to every eye?
As poesy, and songs that never die,
And tears, and laughter, boundaries defy?

What are our States, that we should die for them?
Or our officials, schooled to stratagem,
That we should make them more than God betimes?
Sell truth for their deceiving pantomimes?
And lift above all virtues foulest crimes?

When shall our peace be more than armistice
Wherein fools lead us on to worse abyss?
Great God! when shall the fiends from earth be driven,
And men, forgiving as they are forgiven,
Do Thy will here, as it is done in heaven?

ROBERT WHITAKER.

What Can We Do?

We are nearing the twelfth anniversary of the armistice which interrupted the World War of 1914-18, and we are warned by sober students of international affairs that "the nations are preparing for a big war between 1935 and 1940." The immediate authority for this prediction, which is being broadcast by the American Federation of Labor *News Service*, is Professor C. Delisle Burns, of the University of Glasgow, speaking before the Institute of Politics at Williamstown, Massachusetts in quite recent days. Benito Mussolini, of Italy, is said to have indicated 1935 as the approximate period for another world conflagration. Other observers of social trends could be named on the side of the same ghastly expectations.

Here are a few of the things Professor Burns said, after indicating the analogies between the situations which are shaping up in world politics and world alliances similar to those international preparations and combinations which prevailed five years before 1914. "If you make policies now that get you into trouble in 1935 no League of Nations will get you out of it then. We are drifting toward a situation from which no machinery will be able to rescue us." And over against this stringent warning he sets this sinister conclusion, "Logically speaking we must either abolish Western civilization or war, because they cannot be harmonized."

There is a more optimistic note in this remark, yet the optimism is carefully checked by the emphasis of the very brief period between us and the probable catastrophe. "Under this crust of preparation for war the States are growing stronger in cooperation. The tendency toward peace is becoming stronger, but we have only a five-year breathing space."

How old will your boys be five years from now? Old enough so that you can spare them for cannon fodder? Just how strong is the peace sentiment in the circles in which you move? Strong enough to withstand the rapids of hysteria into which our nation is likely to be flung again however we may assure ourselves now, as we did in 1914, that we are too far removed to be involved? Your church, for instance? Probably your minister has had more to say about the desirability of world unity, possibly even of disarmament, than was the case twenty years ago. But how much does it really mean to the members of the congregation in general? What assurance have you in the somewhat increased amount of peace talk that a war declaration on the part of our government would not awaken a worse persecution of pacifist resistance to war than characterized the outbreak of our war with Germany? Is there not, in fact, a greater increase on the side of potential belligerency, not only in the way of material but of moral armament, than there is on the side of peace? The American Legion was not here when the outbreak came in 1917. The patro-maniac groups, to name them for what they would speedily prove to be in such a crisis, are much more in evidence today than they were then. American Fascism, shaping to greater and greater strength under the smoke-screens of various and sundry "protective" programs now, would be quick to unveil its iron fangs and claws under the lashings of a war-press which, unless all the signs fail, would be as mad for blood as ever our

newspapers have been. Would not the very prospect of a stiffer resistance to war, by reason of the considerable amount of anti-war talk in which churches and other quite respectable organizations have indulged, hasten the steps of the war-mongers and intensify their ruthlessness in sweeping all dissent and even the most moderate discussion out of the way?

Our danger is in the persuasion that we have built defenses against such hysterias and stampedes when as yet we have only sand-banks of words to fall back upon, and political pledges which the directors of governments have already demonstrated they are quite ready to disregard. Of less consequence than the "scraps of paper" which German militarists swept aside with open contempt when the World War began, in which infidelities they had companionship enough on the part of the Allies later, would be our treaties and pacts as they stand to date. There will be those who will deny that we are relatively in worse position than we were in 1917, but on the whole the facts seem to justify such a pessimistic conclusion if we weigh honestly the enlargement of actual war preparations and the more militaristic moods of those whose enrollment in the fighting ranks in 1917-18 has filled them with a dictatorial spirit now, and a lawless impatience with any and all outside of governmental and military ranks. These would feel it their bounden duty at once to take charge of the country and force everybody else into line. Such are assuredly the indications of the hour. Not peace, but war has gained upon us in the twelve years since the Armistice was signed, as the event will prove when war breaks forth again, *unless there is a militancy of anti-militarism in the immediate future beyond anything which has appeared yet.*

"What can we do about it?" This question challenges one on every hand. And one very important part of the answer is obvious enough. We can at least face the facts, and quit fooling ourselves that we are winning the race at our two-mile-an-hour pace against the running march of the militarists. Realism is our first requirement, even though some hail it as defeatism. We are too comfortably consenting to our own timid advances, instead of crying out the alarm and insisting upon the awakedness which must be our first action. We can cry aloud. Never has there been a great social arousement but that some few had to make a vast noise in advance.

To do this effectively we must have local organization, and organization for action rather than for talk. Long before the Declaration of Independence was issued Committees of Correspondence were at work, from community to community. These localized groups who got acquainted and encouraged and directed one another as to local agitations were what gave the movement for independence its success. There is needed a Clearing House for American Anti-militarism, and a co-ordination of the units of opposition to war such as will put the fear of God into the hearts of the politicians. Also we must go farther than this and unite to openly challenge every candidate for office as to whether he or she will make the Outlawry of War, now a part of our national law, a reality and not merely a form of words. We must study for methods of non-cooperation in all public affairs where the glorification of war is carried on. (Even to the open boycotting of churches which celebrate military memorials, politicians who attend upon and take part in such functions, and stores upon those streets where military parades are allowed.) It is time we did something besides talk. It is time that we put our admiration of India's marvellous anti-imperial campaign into a like non-violent but equally vigorous campaign of our own. We have "just talked" long enough. Another world war is a horror so beyond the powers of words to tell, so unspeakably consequential to us all, that to stop it *before it starts* is the first and greatest concern of every sane human in the world today. And we are not going to stop it by just being "nice" about it. The arguments against war are all in, and have been in for a long time. The sentiment against war is widespread, but so wanting in solidarity and resolution that crystallizes into action it is pitifully ineffective. The militarists have things their way because they act while we just talk. As uncompromising toward war as Garrison was toward slavery a century ago, as the early prohibitionists were toward the saloon, as the women whom the critics of even a generation ago called "Them Loud," were in their agitation for women's rights, so must we be, and as willing to bear with like opposition in our day.

It is time to call the roll of those who want to *do something* against the mounting militarism of our day. We shall find plenty to do when we are willing to do it.

ROBERT WHITAKER.

Major Attitudes Toward the Problem of Peace and War

During the fateful days of the summer of 1914, I was delivering lectures in which I proved conclusively, at least to my own satisfaction, that the nations of the world were so interrelated, commercially and otherwise, that international war on a large scale would never again take place. Upon leaving the platform one afternoon I went out onto the street and heard the newsboys announcing the beginning of hostilities which resulted in the greatest war of all time.

In those days most of us were unrealistic in our attitude toward international matters. But, there were social scientists who had long been telling us that the piling up of armaments would eventuate in just such a calamity as we witnessed from 1914 to 1918.

Never shall we forget our war-time experiences. Those of us who had thought war on a large scale impossible, and especially those of us who opposed America's entrance into the War, found it very difficult to readjust our thinking rapidly enough to be in harmony with the war-time spirit that speedily pervaded the country. Most of our fellow citizens for the time being lost all sense of proportion. Many ridiculous things occurred. In Des Moines, Iowa, where I lived during the time that America was engaged in the War, I picked up an afternoon paper and saw a story to the effect that an Austrian had boarded the train in Grinnell and was on his way to Des Moines, that he had in his possession a bottle containing some sort of infernal chemical, and that he was probably planning to blow up the city. A later edition said that he had

been met at the station, arrested and put in jail. No explanation was given as to why he was allowed to get on the train and come to Des Moines with such direful plans in prospect. Several days passed, then appeared a brief story to the effect that a priest had interviewed the prisoner and learned that the bottle contained holy water!

Another example of war-time mentality was an Iowa judge who, when sentencing a violator of a war-time law, delivered from the bench a lengthy oration, which was later printed for wholesale distribution, denouncing the socialistic principles of the prisoner. Just what the political opinions of the prisoner had to do with the specific charges against him was not made known.

Then came the eleventh day of November, 1918. And the whole country was thrilled with the announcement of peace. I myself never shall forget the demonstration in Des Moines. The downtown streets were jammed with almost the entire population of the city. Traffic officers were literally helpless and yet no one seemed irritated over the confusion. From a window of one of the highest buildings hung an effigy of the Kaiser.

Then came the days of almost universal dicussion of peace plans and projects, which discussion has continued to grow in volume. And now, in order that we may continue moving in the right direction, I think it is needful that we get a clear outline of the major attitudes toward the problem of peace and war.

(1) The first major attitude is that war is a manifestation of biological law, and since human nature cannot be changed, war is inevitable. It is true that the struggle for existence has developed patterns of war in the brains of most people. We are told by competent scientists that we are largely motor beings and that we act as we do chiefly because our brain-patterns are what they are; that our brain-patterns are the result not only of our own experiences, not only of our childhood training, but also of the behavior of our pre-human ancestors. Much is made of what is called the biological origin of war. Our early ancestors were driven by powerful enemies to the trees, where they developed hands and increased in strategy. They then returned to the ground of their enemies to resume the fight. Later they discovered fire. They converted metals into crude tools. They captured and tamed animals. They forced the ground to produce food and shelter and clothing. They turned nature against their enemies. Men fought each other. New methods of killing were invented and the crimson path became more crimson. The fighting "instinct," so called, grew and became so powerful that today it is urged as one of the main arguments for war.

But it is forgotten by those who urge the biological origin of war that in evolution mutual aid is a factor of first importance. Prince Kropotkin, in his little book called "Mutual Aid," has proved beyond doubt that mutual aid is no less significant in the evolutionary process than is the competitive struggle for existence.

Moreover, the advocates of the biological necessity for war forget that by the careful scientific application of pedagogical laws, peace patterns may be substituted for war patterns in the brains of the new generation. Human nature is, in point of fact, the most plastic thing in nature. A peace environment would work wonders in moulding the action-patterns of the next generation. That this is possible is evidenced by what man has done for certain lower animals—animals that had developed to be life destroyers more than man. In the brain of the dog, whose ancestors' preservation depended upon the killing of other animals, the old action patterns have been greatly diminished, and peace action patterns greatly augmented. Surely our brains and the brains of our children are as capable of development as are the brains of the dog. What man has done for lower animals, surely he can do for himself and his children.

(2) A second major attitude toward the problem of peace and war is that of the enforcement of peace by superior force. It is the typical militaristic position. Militarism is the "spirit and temper which exalts the militaristic virtues and ideals, and minimizes the defects of military training and the cost of war and the preparation for it." Among the advocates of militarism are many admirable persons whose integrity and honesty of purpose cannot be questioned.

Nevertheless, militarism is subject to two important indictments. First, it is lacking in faith in the power of ideals other than those backed by gun and sword. And second, it has failed to point the way to enduring peace. Little wonder that militarism is lacking in faith in the power of things spiritual, since faith naturally deteriorates under armor plate and is debauched by the frenzied piling up of arms. For years the militarists told us that armaments were the only sure guarantee of peace—that armaments were a sort of peace-insurance. Men who said they knew what they were talking about wrote it, published it, spoke it. Peace, they insisted, depends upon the size of armies and navies. The nations accepted this doctrine, piled up armaments, were ready for war—and, as might have been expected, war came. In our present state of development, armaments to do police duty may be defended, but armaments sufficient to engage in offensive war and a military class to urge it cannot be defended.

The attitude of those who believe in maintaining peace by superior force is also the position of the Imperialists. The stock arguments of the Imperialists are that superior wisdom is possessed by the successful powers—the so-called great powers—and that the backward peoples, being incapable of self-government, need outside control. It is on this theory that Great Britain holds India, that the United States holds the Philippines, that France holds Syria. And it is on this theory that every imperialistic power justifies its use of other peoples, irrespective of their needs, for the interest of the governing power.

I think perhaps the most powerful argument against imperialism is that no nation is sufficiently powerful morally and spiritually to govern another people without suffering the degeneration of its own soul. It is proverbial that the soul of the master degenerates within the body of the slave. It would be quite impossible to over-estimate the damage to the spiritual life of Great Britain resulting from her control by coercive means of India and other countries. And already we in America are beginning to pay the price in loss of the love of liberty, for our own imperialistic doings.

Moreover, it should be remembered that people cannot be coerced into cultural growth. Culture is a social behavior-pattern which has grown out of the thought and life of a people themselves, or of customs

and ideas that are deliberately chosen by them. A people may be persuaded to adopt foreign ways of life, but they can hardly be forced to do so. The bodies of a people may be kept in subjection for generations, but their spirits will be in a constant state of rebellion and sooner or later the rebellion will break into the open. This very thing is happening now on a large scale in India, in Palestine, and in Syria. Nothing seems to me to be surer than that coercive, militaristic, imperialistic methods not only do not produce peace, but are certain to produce war.

(3) A third major attitude toward the problem of peace and war is that of arbitration. Without doubt the principle and the practice of arbitration have effected great good in international relations. It is one of the glories of America to have led in the signing of arbitration treaties. We sent the first case to the Hague Court, and were largely responsible for securing the permanency of the Court. Before the beginning of the World War, we offered practically an unlimited arbitration treaty to the great nations.

Among the arguments for arbitration are these: First, it represents a willingness to give and take. In all other human relations we find it necessary to concede many things which on theoretical grounds we believe to be our rights, and to grant to others things which we believe they have no reasonable right to expect. It is a wholesome thing to carry this spirit over into the relationships between nations.

Again, the principle of arbitration admits the possibility of error due to proximity of interests. When a person is very close to a situation, it is easy to fail to see the rights and interests of others. A fundamental principle of getting along with one's neighbors is that of willingness to admit quite freely the possibility of error in one's judgments. Arbitration carries this principle over into international affairs.

But perhaps the chief argument for arbitration is that it actually makes use of competent, unbiased opinion. The agreement of nations to submit their differences to the opinion of competent persons who have no selfish interests to serve, is a great step forward in the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Obviously, arbitration is a move in the right direction. Nevertheless, there are sound arguments against arbitration which I think set definite limits to it. First of all, there is the danger of settlement for settlement's sake, without due regard for the rights involved. This danger is, I think, especially noticeable in the settlement by arbitration of disputes between capital and labor. It is also noticeable in the arbitration of minor disputes between neighbors. The danger is that arbitrators will feel that their primary duty is to secure a settlement, and if one party to the dispute is more vigorous than the other, he is likely to gain concessions from the arbitrators, and finally from his opponent, which may or may not harmonize with justice.

When arbitrators are considering the differences between nations, they, too, are likely to feel that they can overlook so-called technical questions, which sometimes involve fundamental liberties, if by so doing they can bring about a quick settlement. But in my opinion such procedure does not make for enduring peace.

Again, there is the unconscious bias toward the claims of the powerful nations. I do not say that this bias always operates, even unconsciously in the arbitrators. What I claim is that the danger of its so operating is sufficient to put the arbitration procedure in grave suspicion when the settlement is between a powerful, successful nation on the one hand and a small and struggling people, on the other.

Moreover, the policy of arbitration left the legality of war unchanged and unchallenged. The challenge to the legality of war came not from the advocates of arbitration, but from another quarter, about which I expect to speak more at length a bit later. There is a vast difference between a mere agreement to settle disputes without war if possible, and the other principle which says that war itself, whatever its cause, shall be regarded as utterly illegal and of no standing whatever in international relations.

(4) A fourth major attitude toward the problem of peace and war is that of disarmament. In recent years there have been various attempts made to reduce armaments by the agreement of the nations to accept certain ratios. It has been argued by the advocates of disarmament that the laying down of arms and the sinking of ships on the part of some powerful nation would be an example to the rest of the world which would probably result in a more or less general disarmament. Thus far, however, no one of the great nations has deemed it feasible so to do. And it is highly improbable that had a nation done so, the result would have been as expected by the advocates of disarmament.

Also, it has been argued that disarmament merely as a policy of economy would have a marked effect upon the prosperity of nations. To me this seems a valid argument. A very large percentage of the budgets of nations now goes for wars, past, present or to come. Think what could be done in the way of great public improvements, with the money that now goes into the building of ships, the purchase of armaments, the upkeep of armies and navies, and other war-like expenditures.

A modern argument for disarmaments is that science is developing so rapidly that a given means of warfare is out of date by the time it can be completed and made ready for use. What are battle ships and guns, when a few chemicals can destroy a city? In spite of the tremendous moral appeal that the disarmament program has made to all who think idealistically, it must nevertheless be pointed out that to secure disarmament was hardly possible so long as war was a legal method of settling international disputes—just as legal as the appointment of commissions of arbitration.

Moreover, the ease with which new armaments are produced, or new methods of warfare developed, makes disarmament less siginficant than would at first seem to be the case. Indeed, it seems to be possible for people to fight irrespective of the nature of their weapons. There were wars before modern armaments existed. Stones and sticks were, and still are, dangerous weapons. Now that war has been outlawed by internatnonal treaty agreement, it would seem that disarmament should proceed apace; but even here we must not expect too much in the way of disarmament until the peoples of the world have had time to realize just what is involved in the renouncing of war as an instrument of national policy.

(5) A fifth major attitude toward the problem of peace and war is that of non-participation. Some years ago Sir Arthur Ponsonby started in England

what came to be known as the Ponsonby plan. The scheme was to secure the signatures of tens of thousands of people to an agreement never again to participate in a war. Another example of this type of opposition is the conscientious objector. And while this plan has the advantage of appealing to the heroic qualities in individuals, it nevertheless fails to take into consideration the corporate realities of international relations.

Following the World War, the *Christian Century* advocated the excommunication of war. The idea seemed to be that the ministers and the churches and religious conferences should agree never again to support a war, whatever its cause. Various student groups fell in with the idea, and in general the plan was helpful as a means of calling the attention of people to the utter inconsistency between war, on the one hand, and the Christian principle of brotherly love, on the other. But this plan failed to take into account the overlapping claims of church and state.

The general theory of non-resistance has many supporters and a considerable literature. Jesus is claimed as a non-resistant, and his admonition to resist not evil is the scriptural basis of the movement. Tolstoy was perhaps the greatest of the modern advocates of the principle. It was, however, pointed out from time to time that non-resistance was in fact a method of super-resistance. This is the idea of Gandhi, who conducted in South Africa, and later in India, a movement called non-violent non-cooperation. In India at present Gandhi is leading his people in open rebellion against British rule. Non-cooperation has passed into positive violation of British-made laws and regulations. And while the principle of non-violence still holds with Mr. Gandhi himself and his followers, it is practically certain that the movement cannot permanently remain non-violent.

(6) A sixth, and final, major attitude toward the problem of peace and war is that of Outlawry. The idea of the Outlawry of War is one of those epoch-making ideas that come only at infrequent intervals in the life of mankind. The father of the idea is Mr. S. O. Levinson of Chicago.

Back in 1917, Mr. Levinson, who had two sons in the war, realized as he had not before, that the nations and the peoples of the world were in the grip of a monster system, which they did not like, which they feared and hated, but which they seemed utterly powerless to control. He reflected that this system was supported by four-fifths of the international law then in existence; that it was enriched by the overwhelming percentage of the budgets of the nations; that it was glorified in the press, in the pulpit, and in the text books of the world.

He saw the practical impossibility of regulating the thing; that it must either be accepted or outlawed. Upon further reflection he recalled that all great issues were at bottom moral questions, and that ideally law should be found on the moral side of all issues. From such reflections came the idea of putting the law of the nations on the side of the opposition to war. This meant a complete facing about. Whereas the nations had from time immemorial marched foolishly but legally in the direction of war, Mr. Levinson's idea was that they should face about completely and march intelligently and legally in the direction of peace.

Senator Knox was one of the first converts to the idea, and later Mr. Levinson won the support of Senator Borah and the philosopher, John Dewey. Other men of note joined Mr. Levinson, including Charles Clayton Morrison, editor of the *Christian Century* and author of an authoritative volume called "The Outlawry of War." The movement rapidly grew until it became a veritable gospel with an increasing body of literature and competent exponents.

The idea of Outlawry includes three essentials. The first is the agreement by international treaty to renounce war as an instrument of national policy. When Briand wrote to the American Secretary of State proposing a bi-lateral treaty, he used the term "Outlawry of War" and referred to it as an American term. You are familiar with the lengthy discussion that followed Briand's proposal, which resulted in not a bi-lateral but a multi-lateral treaty, and which has now been signed by practically all the nations of the world. The Paris Peace Pact, now a part of the basic law of mankind, and representing a complete change in the mind of the world on the matter of war, is the direct outgrowth of the idea of Outlawry as conceived in the mind of S. O. Levinson.

Renouncing war as an instrument of national policy means that all disputes are either to be settled by peaceful means or to remain forever unsettled. But it is the belief of the advocates of Outlawry that the intellignce of the world is sufficient to find peaceful means of settling disputes when there is no longer the danger of warfare.

A second essential of the Outlawry of War is the codification of international law on the basis of the illegality of war. This step has not yet been taken by the nations, but it must be taken in due time. The Peace Pact has scrapped the majority of international law; and time will be required not only to evolve new laws on the basis of Outlawry, but also to recodify existing peace laws. In the future the body of international law will consist of the laws of peace, based upon principles of equity and justice, a large part of which will no doubt be taken from the equity codes already developed in civilized countries. And the old laws applying to conditions of warfare, rules and regulations of battle, contraband, neutrality and the like, will be abandoned.

The third essential of Outlawry is a World Supreme Court, depending for its sanctions on the good faith of the peoples of the world, on enlightened public opinion, and on world sentiment against war. Our own United States Supreme Court is an example of what is meant. The sovereign states of the American Union have settled by way of the Supreme Court ninety controversies without the shedding of a drop of blood.

The peace philosophy that underlies the Outlawry idea is:

1—that force should never be used in the settlement of international disputes; 2—that the peoples of the world can be depended upon to keep their word in agreeing not to go to war; 3—that in the operation of the World Supreme Court there shall be no obligation on the part of the participating nations to use force in carrying out the decisions of the Court; 4—that all world machinery such as confederations and leagues should function wholly on the basis of the voluntary action of the nations; and 5—that the supreme sanction of peace is the mind of right.

CURTIS W. REESE.

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

"The Nation Is Dry"

Former Judge Griffiths, of Seattle, Sure of Prohibition's Success

I judge by reading your paper that New York politicians are wet. But New York is dry, drier than I have seen it for fifty-three years. The nation is dry. I have traversed it from coast to coast many times before and since prohibition.

National prohibition is an outstanding success. Enemies would break it down before too late.

I am a Republican of Washington State. Republican action here largely shapes the national policies of the party.

Republican leaders, I submit, are wasting their time and energy on the barren matter of repeal. Conditions call urgently for constructive measures.

There is not more drinking than before prohibition. The crime volume is not due to prohibition. Our people don't hanker after drink.

The people want to eat, to work, to live decently and up to the American standard.

The real issue for statesmen is economic. Unemployment, current and recurrent. It must be stopped. If the country were wet the general condition would be much worse.

No trouble springs from lack of strong drink. Even the "Whisky Rebellion" petered out. Its valiant talkers took to tall timber when Washington sent a few troops. It is hard to keep an army for freedom to get drunk.

Repeal the Eighteenth Amendment for what? Remedies vaunted and warranted by amenders, straddlers, substituters and state controllers, have each been tried and found wanting. The saloon was hailed as a panacea. Now, it carries all the sins of the camp into the wilderness. The sovereign state now shall be sole tavern keeper. Uncle Sam shall be general roustabout, open and shut up and sweep out as accumulations may imperatively demand.

Suppose repeal came tomorrow? Agitation would never end until we circled back to where we are. Barring a few conscientious objectors to any prohibition, no moral issue is at stake.

State rights are a myth. The whole United States is smaller, more interwoven, than New York State a hundred years ago.

Personal liberty is not recognized by any civilized country, least of all by the United States, in dealing with the liquor traffic. Sale of bread and of drink are not in the same class.

The liquor business is incapable of settled regulation. The evil is not in methods, but in the use of alcohol itself. America's conscience will not allow the states to debauch their citizenship by sale of actual intoxicants.

Moral conception and legal steps have brought the painful evolution of public authority to its ultimate, national prohibition. Nothing lies beyond. Other countries are slowly climbing after us.

"O, thou invisible spirit of wine, if thou hast no other name to be known by, let us call thee devil." (Shakespeare).

Devil it has been. Politicians and mercenaries may raise the "devil" with the Eighteenth Amendment. But it will stand.

—*Austin E. Griffiths,*
New York *Tribune.*

"How to Find God"

Rev. Sydney Strong, editor of the books, "We Believe in Immortality" and "We Believe in Prayer," is requesting help in the preparation of a much needed book for youth, on "How to Find God." This book, which is to be a non-commercial enterprise, will consist of the Fifty Best Replies sent him, that will be most helpful in answering the question, How to Find God. Everyone, without regard to age, nationality, race, is invited to participate and send in statements, not over 300 words in length. These may be prose, or poetry, but must be original.

The following well-known leaders have consented, as individuals, to sponsor the undertaking: Dr. Clarence A. Barbour, President, Brown University; Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert, General Secretary, Federal Council; Dr. Daniel A. Poling, President, International C. E.; Fred W. Ramsey, General Secretary, National Council Y. M. C. A. These will choose a committee to select the Fifty Best Statements, as judged by the criterion, What will be most helpful to modern youth in answering the question, How to Find God.

The statements are to be sent to the undersigned—typewritten and not over 300 words—not later than February 1st, 1931.

Sydney Strong, Hotel Wolcott, 4 West 31st Street, New York City.

Dr. Strong's personal statement follows:

For sometime I have felt that an inexpensive book should be prepared, primarily for youth—the period of storm and stress—on the subject, "How to Find God." I propose to undertake it, and in the following manner.

Instead of selecting fifty people to furnish answers to the question, I am turning to the public and extending an invitation to everyone, without regard to age, nationality, race, to furnish not over 300 words, calculated to answer the question, How to Find God. The Fifty Best Replies will be published in an inexpensive book. These may be in prose or poetry. They must be original.

I have chosen this democratic way for several reasons. It will stimulate people to formulate their ideas. It is calculated to provoke discussion of this vital theme in press, pulpit, classes. It will probably result in producing answers best calculated to satisfy the intelligence of modern youth.

The age is calling for a fresh statement about God that will satisfy youth. The supreme quest of life is to seek to find God. A wide response is therefore confidently expected.

The Mid-Southern Regional Conference

of the National Federation of Religious Liberals, will be held in Greensboro, N. C., November 11-12-13, 1930. The opening session will be held at Temple Emanuel, 713 N. Greene St., Rabbi Milton Ellis, presiding.

Among those to speak are:
Rabbi Louis Mendoza,
Rev. F. B. Bishop, D. D.,
Rev. J. W. Sears,
Prof. Glenn Johnson,
Rev J. Edward Kirbye, D. D.,
Miss Etta Spier,
Rev. Ronald J. Tamblyn,
Rev. Charles E. Snyder,
Rev. Roger F. Etz, D. D.,
Prof. A. S. Keister,
Prof. Howard M. Odum,
Dr. Elbert Russell.

The program announces Round Table Discussions: Obstructions to the Progress of Liberalism, Children and Youth as Factors of the Social Problem, Does Religious Belief Affect Our Social Thinking, etc.

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in
HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

NOVEMBER

With its brisk, wintry touches, suggests that your furs be at once conditioned for their season of heavy usage. Delicate, skilled and dependable are the processes by which we brush, cleanse, sanitize and prolong the life of the fur garments you entrust us with.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0281 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Massing for Prohibition's Greatest Drive

NO WONDER public sentiment against prohibition is gaining. The metropolitan press by and large seems to avoid printing the dry side of the story. Facts favoring prohibition are frequently lost in a maze of wet propaganda. Often items concerning prohibition are twisted into an argument against prohibition . . . a Federal officer is killed by a bootlegger with a criminal record of twenty years, and the news headline is "snooper killed."

Unfortunately for the common good, facts are distorted; editorials are assaults on prohibition; nothing is left unturned by the wet radical papers to discredit the greatest moral reform of the century.

The majority of the people in the most populous centers of the United States form their opinion from the mass of liquor propaganda. Why shouldn't they wonder about the benefits of prohibition? Why shouldn't they begin to think or act against the Eighteenth Amendment?

It's time to do something. Let's give the people the facts about prohibition. Despite the excellent work done by the religious and other law-upholding publications of the nation in telling the true story, much work is yet to be done. We must reach the masses, who read only the daily newspapers, whose thoughts and actions—and votes—are controlled by the papers.

Let's give them the real facts: that drinking has decreased; that crime has lessened; that the death rate has been lowered; that the standard of living has been raised; that the nation as a whole as well as the individual has been materially benefited.

The people should know the truth about prohibition. Only the truth, told now in a forceful manner, will save prohibition.

The American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation after months of exhaustive research has gathered the facts that prove conclusively the great success of prohibition. It has given the facts, through its press bureau, to the newspapers of the country. Papers that are fair have printed them. But many wet papers have ignored them—and it is to the twenty millions of readers of the wet press that we must give the facts.

To reach this mass of readers—most of whom are fair-minded and who will appreciate the truth—this Foundation is going to advertise nation-wide. Full pages of paid newspaper advertising will be published in wet as well as dry papers—to reach everybody!

The work of spreading the truth to the largest reading public can be accomplished in no better manner. Paid advertisements will tell the actual facts as they exist; the messages cannot be ignored, edited, or controverted by an unfair paper. It must be done now. It will be done!

Will you help?

Notice the partial list of the Advisory Board of this Foundation. In addition, there are 34 others of similar high character. Every member is listed in Who's Who. Every one is outstanding in his respective line of endeavor. They are backing this movement. Will you join them?

Let's Have The TRUTH About Prohibition

The American Business Men's Prohibition Foundation is incorporated in Illinois "not for profit" and is a voluntary association organized to collect, correlate and disseminate facts regarding the results of National Prohibition and its relation to the welfare and progress of the people of the United States. Your personal contribution, small or large, will help.

Advisory Board

HERBERT T. AMES, *Lawyer, Pennsylvania*
FRANCIS E. BALDWIN, *Manufacturer, N. Y.*
R. B. BENJAMIN, *Manufacturer, Chicago*
DAN B. BRUMMITT, *Editor, Chicago*
WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN, *Pres. Indiana Univ.*
P. H. CALLAHAN, *Manufacturer, Louisville*
ANDREW B. CRICHTON, *Coal Mines, Pennsylvania*
ALLAN C. EMERY, *Wool Merchant, Massachusetts*
F. J. HARWOOD, *Manufacturer, Wisconsin*
R. J. KITTREDGE, *Manufacturer, Chicago*
HENRY M. LELAND, *Manufacturer, Detroit*
GEORGE W. MARSTON, *Merchant, San Diego*
S. S. McCLURE, *Editor, Publisher*
P. W. MORGAN, *Banker, Pennsylvania*
MRS. H. W. PEABODY, *Chairman, Woman's Nat. Com. for Law Enforcement*
JAMES C. PENNEY, *Penney Stores*
CHARLES C. SELECMAN, *Pres., Southern Methodist Univ.*
MRS. JOHN F. SIPPEL, *Pres., Gen. Fed. of Women's Clubs*
JOHN TIMOTHY STONE, *Pres., McCormick Seminary*
LOUIS J. TABER, *Master, National Grange*

and 34 others

B-B

AMERICAN BUSINESS MEN'S PROHIBITION FOUNDATION

7 South Dearborn Street, CHICAGO, ILL. R-12

I WANT TO HELP

☐ I am a staunch supporter of the preservation of American ideals and the glorious cause of Prohibition. I am willing to back my belief with cash. You can count on me to the extent of $.....which is enclosed. *Make check payable to* ALONZO E. WILSON, *Treasurer.*

☐ Send free booklet, "Let's Have the Truth About Prohibition."

Write your name and address in the margin below; clip this coupon and mail at once.